

**REMARKS**

Please consider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Disposition of the Claims**

Claims 31-48 are pending in the application. Claims 31, 37, and 43 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims.

**Claim Amendments**

Claims 31, 37, and 42-43 have been amended by this reply. Claims 31, 37, and 43 have been amended to clarify the scope of the invention. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, paragraphs [0027]-[0031] and [0034] of the Specification. Further, claim 42 has been amended to resolve an antecedent basis issue. No new matter is added by way of these amendments.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. To the extent this rejection applies to the pending claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Examiner asserts that a computer readable medium was not disclosed in the Specification. Applicants respectfully assert that a computer readable medium is disclosed in the Specification, at

least in paragraph [0034]. Accordingly the rejection is traversed and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 31 has been amended by this reply to clarify that the FQDN mapping module is stored on a computer readable storage medium. In the case *In Re Beauregard*, the Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks declared “that computer programs embodied in a tangible medium, such as floppy diskettes, are patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101,” and further conceded that the claims of *In Re Beauregard* were statutory. *In Re Beauregard*, 53 F.3d 1583 (1995); U.S. Patent No. 5,710,578 (“Beauregard”). Claim 31 now includes a computer readable storage medium and is statutory in view of Beauregard. Accordingly, the rejection is now traversed and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 31-33, 36-39, 42-45, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,892,919 (“Nielsen”). To the extent this rejection applies to the pending claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

“A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). Further, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” *Richardson v.*

*Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants assert that Nielsen fails to disclose each and every element of the amended independent claims.

Specifically, with respect to claim 31, Nielsen fails to disclose “a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) detection module, configured to ... determine that the URL request is an invalid URL request when the URL request is inconsistent with a predefined URL stored in a cookie.” At best, Nielsen discloses using a spell check to determine that a URL is invalid. See, *e.g.*, Fig. 5. Further, Nielsen fails to disclose redirection of only invalid URLs. Rather, Nielsen discloses redirection of all URLs into a spell check mechanism such that when a URL is not found in the cache, the URL is issued unchanged. Accordingly, Nielsen determines that URLs that are not found are valid URLs and thus treats all URLs as invalid URLs before processing. See, *e.g.*, Fig. 5. Accordingly, Nielsen fails to disclose each and every element of amended independent claim 31.

For the reasons stated above, amended independent claim 31 is patentable over Nielsen. Claims 37 and 43 include similar limitations to claim 31 and are patentable over Nielsen for at least the same reasons. Further, claims 32-33, 36, 38-39, 42, 44-45, and 48 depend from independent claims 31, 37, and 43 and are also patentable over Nielsen for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 34-35, 40-41, and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624 (“Teare”). To the extent this rejection applies to the pending claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference; ...” MPEP § 2143(A).

For the reasons stated above, claims 31, 37, and 43 are patentable over Nielsen. Further, a review of Teare shows that Teare fails to disclose that which Nielsen lacks. For example, regarding claim 31, Teare is silent regarding “a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) detection module, configured to ... determine that the URL request is an invalid URL request when the URL request is inconsistent with a predefined URL stored in a cookie.” Accordingly, Nielsen and Teare fail to teach or suggest, either individually or in combination, each and every element of claim 31. Thus, Claim 31 is patentable over Nielsen and Teare.

Independent claims 37 and 43 include similar limitations to independent claim 31 and are patentable over Nielsen and Teare for at least the same reasons. Further, claims 34-35, 40-41, and 46-47 depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims and, thus, are also patentable over Nielsen and Teare for at least the same reasons. Accordingly the rejection is traversed and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/493002).

Dated: November 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/  
Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicants